National Center for Education Statistics Disclaimer

The information and opinions published here are the product of the International Indicators of Education Systems project's Network A and do not necessarily represent the policy of views of the Department of Education or the National Center for Education Statistics.

NETWORK A MEETING RECORD

Network A Plenary Session
March 9-10, 2006, Seoul, Korea

Participants

Eugene Owen, Network A Chair
Wendy Whitham, Australia
Jürgen Horschinegg, Austria
Ariane Baye, Belgium (French)
Luc van de Poele, Belgium (Flemish)
Don Hoium, Canada
Tamara Knighton, Canada
Lubomir Martinec, Czech Republic
Jørn Skovsgaard, Denmark
Thierry Rocher, France
Botho Priebe, Germany
Panyotis Kazantzis, Greece
Zsuzsa Hamori-Vaczy, Hungary
Júlíus Björnsson, Iceland
Gerry Shiel, Ireland
Ryo Watanabe, Japan
Mee-Kyeong Lee, Korea
Sun-Ho Kim, Korea
Iris Blanke, Luxembourg
Felipe Martinez Rizo, Mexico
Jules Peschar, Netherlands
Renze Portengen, Netherlands
Lynne Whitney, New Zealand
Anne-Berit Kavli, Norway
Gloria Ramalho, Portugal
Eva Paez Pena, Spain
Anita Wester, Sweden
Erich Ramseier, Switzerland
Sevki Karaca, Turkey
Lorna Bertrand, United Kingdom
Elois Scott, United States
Andreas Schleicher, OECD Secretariat
Jay Moskowitz, Network A Secretariat
Maria Stephens, Network A Secretariat
Euhwa Tran, Network A Secretariat

Observers

Esther Ho Sui Chu, Hong Kong
Michal Beller, Israel
Anders Hingel, European Commission

Presenter

Irwin Kirsch, Educational Testing Service

Regrets

Helene Babel, Austria
Pavla Zieleniecova, Czech Republic
Jorma Kuusela, Finland
Vladislav Rosa, Slovak Republic
Ramon Pajares Box, Spain
Anna Barklund, Sweden

Summary of Major Outcomes

Network A had several points of business and presentations at the meeting. The major outcomes were:

- With regard to PIAAC, members agreed to proceed with the Network's proposal to provide developmental assistance for the conceptual framework for "literacy in the information age." Network members were requested to provide nominations of individuals with relevant expertise to the Network A Secretariat and the development working group chair. A small group of working group members, the Network Chair, and Network A and OECD Secretariats will then propose a group of experts to participate in a workshop to be convened in May/June around the questions elaborated in the proposal and discussed in Seoul.

- With regard to the development group's other initiative – brainstorming new areas for developmental work – Network members were requested to share their ideas with the Network A Secretariat and the development working group chair. A synthesis will be compiled and shared with members for their reaction. This activity is to help inform areas in which the Network might eventually undertake work.

- With regard to the database of national-level assessment and testing activities, the Network A Secretariat, in conjunction with the data working group chair, will: proceed with follow-up with the four countries for which a response is still needed and finalize the database; undertake the additional analyses suggested at the meeting; and work to make the information available online in a user-friendly and updateable format.

- Additionally, the data working group chair will stay abreast of developments regarding cooperation among international data providers and, if agreed by the working group, will draft a terms of reference for the forum that might be established for such cooperation.

- The Network A Secretariat, in cooperation with the analysis, reporting, and dissemination working group chair, will revise the indicators according to members' comments at the plenary meeting. In particular, the indicators will be revised with an eye toward simplification of presentation and careful interpretation of emerging policy messages. Members are encouraged to send any additional comments to the Network A Secretariat and the working group chair as soon as possible.

Welcome and Introductions

Maria Stephens opened the meeting, introducing herself and informing members that Eugene Owen would be participating via videoconference. Kyung-Hoi Kim from the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development officially welcomed members to Korea, and Maria then introduced new and returning participants from Belgium (French community), Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, and the United Kingdom and expressed regrets from Finland and the Slovak Republic. Eugene thanked the Korean hosts for making the video conference possible and also expressed his thanks to Network members for all their hard work. Last, Maria

went over the agenda, and the Network approved the minutes of the last meeting without changes.

Introduction to PIAAC Development Work

To open the meeting, Andreas Schleicher provided an update on the OECD's planning and strategy for the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), and Luc Van de Poele gave a presentation on Network A's proposed involvement with developmental work for PIAAC. Briefly, the Network will convene a small group of member-nominated experts in May/June 2006 to address questions related to the feasibility of a single scale, the definition of the domain, and options for delivery, which would be summarized in a paper that would be available to members after the expert meeting and submitted for the Joint Session meeting by August.

Following the presentations, Eugene first commended the working group for their work and then asked members for their thoughts on the proposed activities. Lynne Whitney began the discussion by asking whether the new assessment would have any connection to the Adult Literacy and Lifeskills (ALL) study. Andreas responded that the OECD considers compatibility with previous measures to be an extremely valuable and ideal requirement but that not all countries agree on this issue. Luc added that comparability was a topic discussed within the development working group and would be one of the questions addressed at the experts' workshop.

Lorna Bertrand asked about the timeline for establishing a governing board for the assessment, sharing the concern that the Network would be developing a product before knowing the composition and perspective of such a body. Andreas stated that he hoped a governing board eventually would be established, especially considering the success of the PISA Governing Board, but that the Joint Education Committee and CERI would serve as the governing board for the time being. Eugene pointed out that the strategy for PISA had been established before the creation of a governing board and that the board had assumed responsibility for the project as it stood. Thus, he expected that a future PIAAC governing board also would accept responsibility for the assessment in accordance with how it had been developed.

Maria concluded the session by inviting members to send nominations for possible experts and any additional comments directly to the Network A Secretariat and the development working group chair.

Information Session on "Literacy in the Information Age"

In the next session, Irwin Kirsch from the Educational Testing Service (ETS) gave a presentation on literacy in the information age.

Jørn Skovsgaard opened the discussion by thanking Irwin for his presentation and asking about the possibility of an assessment that not only tests the ability to take in and to understand information but also measures the skills needed to solve problems and to effectively communicate information. In response, Irwin elaborated on two types of problems that have been

used in measuring ICT literacy, the first being more directive in providing step-by-step instructions and the second being more open-ended in allowing the test-taker to solve the problem with whatever method he/she chooses. He noted, however, the open-ended questions are more time-consuming, and thus an assessment cannot include too many of these types of problems. Irwin concluded that any assessment needs a balance: while open-ended questions play an integral role, they also provide fewer data points. Following up on this point, Luc asked how many data points are needed to create a reliable measurement. Irwin replied that that question is still being explored because development of these kinds of tasks is still in the beginning stages. He referred to the feasibility study conducted for Network A a few years ago with these open-ended tasks, pointing out that generally test-takers did not perform well on these non-directive problems, but that he expected these items to become an integral part of assessments in the future. He also highlighted the difference between paper-and-pencil assessments such as PISA that require the test-taker to read a piece of text on a single page and an ICT literacy assessment that asks the test-taker to use a website which contains several different pieces of text. With the website, the notion of evaluation and critical thinking becomes even more important because the test-taker is not told what to read and must decide that on his/her own.

Next, Lorna posed a question about those individuals at the lower end of the distribution, specifically asking about whether there was information on what proportion of them had pre-existing physiological conditions, such as dyslexia or attention deficit disorder. Irwin explained that of the 1000 adults assessed, 900 were adults participating in federally sponsored adult education programs, with 300 from a participating in English-as-a-Second-Language classes. Thus, the sample was not necessarily representative of the adult population in the United States as a whole but was representative of the adult education population. He added that the assessment did include questions on whether the students had any health conditions and problems with work due to these conditions and that it might be possible to form a composite score for specific population groups. Following up, Lorna asked if it would be possible to include in a future ICT assessment questions about opportunities for access to ICT and to correlate that with information on socio-economic background. Irwin replied that these questions could be included based on policymakers' desires, and that the administered assessment did include questions about computer engagement and frequency of computer usage.

Jules Peschar asked about the possibility of adaptive testing, and Irwin replied that it would be possible with the current technology to guide the test-taker through the assessment based on performance and to provide scores for core literacy skills as well as overall ICT skills with such adaptive testing. Erich Ramseier asked about the relative importance of the various components of the single scale and whether changing the weight given to each component scale would affect the overall results. Irwin explained that ALL, unlike PISA, consisted of separate scales with unique item parameters for the various components. Items for the composite were chosen from these components and then rescaled. He indicated a preference for keeping the items on separate scales but reiterated that the technology does exist to provide the various scores, with the only limitation being financial costs and amount of time needed for development. Jay Moskowitz raised the question of the long-term applicability (in a rapidly changing environment) of the ICT literacy items. Irwin responded that the analysis of ICT literacy trends would depend on how one designed the measurement. He offered the option of basing measurement on a set of literacy

skills, versus a set of technical skills, which naturally would change over 10 to 15 years. However, he pointed out that one may need to approach trends in a different way and consider population changes in relation to a moving target rather than maintain the same measurement. Eugene raised the question of linking a future assessment back to ALL, which Irwin indicated would be possible as long as enough linking items were included.

Several members asked questions about the possible roles of language in a future assessment. Michal Beller inquired about the feasibility of using this ICT assessment model in a non-English speaking country, specifically asking about the possibility of translating the assessment into Hebrew as well as maintaining portions of the assessment in English. Irwin affirmed the feasibility of translating the assessment into multiple languages and comparing it in an international context. Additionally, as a follow-up to Irwin's point regarding a possible assessment where the test-taker has unlimited access to the internet, Erich pointed out that since English is the prevalent language on the internet, English competency would need to be part of such an assessment. Michal reiterated that she would like to see an assessment with tasks in multiple languages, which Irwin acknowledged would be interesting but difficult to design.

Update on OECD Activities

The second day of the meeting began with an update from Andreas on OECD activities. Topics included the 2007-2008 program of work, governing structures, assessing value-added at schools, and the survey on teachers, teaching, and learning. Following each portion of the presentation, members were given the opportunity to comment and to ask questions.

In relation to the presentation on the program of work, several members asked for more information on specific projects, including the CERI project on social outcomes and the activity on qualification systems. Regarding the social outcomes project, Andreas explained that the project has thus far been focused on health education and labor market outcomes and is working towards developing a conceptual framework linking these areas to education. He added that a conference would be held in Copenhagen in April with researchers from 20 different countries to develop the frameworks and to provide a direction for measurement. In response to Luc's question about the relationship between PIAAC and the activity on qualification systems, Andreas stated that the two are unrelated. He clarified that the goal of the qualification system activity is for countries to exchange experiences in using flexible systems that allow people to decide when and where they want to learn instead of institutional systems that dictate these learning opportunities.

Following the presentation on the governing structure for OECD's education work, Lynne asked for clarification on the process. Andreas explained that the first step is to bring together the chairs and vice-chairs of the education committees to discuss the current governing structures. If the committees are in agreement in how to move forward, the issue is resolved. However, if no agreement is found, the problem then moves to the OECD Council for discussion. If the OECD Council decides on a change, that change will be implemented; if not, then the structures will remain as they are. Andreas indicated that the best result would be for the committees to arrive at a resolution but that the ultimate decision lies with the Council. Lynne expressed her concern that the decision would be influenced by one or two larger countries and asked how smaller

countries might affect the process. In response, Andreas encouraged Network members to express their opinions to their OECD ambassadors, emphasizing that no changes would be made without the agreement of all OECD countries.

Eugene raised two final questions related to the issue of governing structures. First, he asked about a timeline for possible restructuring; second, he asked whether the PGB's status as an autonomous body had changed. In response to the first question, Andreas answered that the issue would be discussed by the Council in May. A decision could be made at that point, or if no consensus is reached, the issue will remain open for discussion. Relating to the second issue, Andreas replied that the PGB's status had not changed but that one of the options for restructuring would be to allow bodies such as the PGB and the CERI Governing Board to retain management roles but not financial responsibilities. He pointed out the distinction that PISA is a program managed and financed by ministries of education but that the OECD Council is funded by foreign ministries.

Following the update on the activity to explore countries' experiences measuring value-added in schools, Jules opened the discussion by asking about the extent of country support (specifically the Netherlands' involvement) for this activity. Andreas answered that the idea for this activity came out of an informal meeting of OECD ministers, in which the Netherlands was very active, and reported that the activity has received high support. Jules asked if the OECD would be inviting the nomination of experts, and Andreas replied that no specific proposal had been released yet but that the request for expert nominations would be sent out after a discussion at the Joint Session.

Iris Blanke asked for clarification on the definition of "school." Andreas explained that the activity will explore how countries measure how the individual school raises the performance of the individual student. He added that if this activity were successful, it would provide countries with a fairer and more appropriate method of ranking schools and could serve as an alternative to ranking schools based on assessments and examinations. Esther Ho Sui Chu questioned the effectiveness of this activity in an international context, but Andreas stated that there is no intention of making international comparisons. Rather, the goal is to establish internationally accepted standards and guidelines for methods of using value-added models at the national level.

In relation to the survey on teachers, teaching, and learning, Júlíus Björnsson opened the discussion by asking about the linking of teaching practices to PISA outcome measures. Andreas replied that teacher data would not be used to predict student performance. Instead, data would be used in the opposite way, with student results used to contextualize information received from teachers. Anders Hingel continued the discussion by first expressing a positive outlook towards the development of this survey, indicating that he believed the survey would satisfy the European Commission's need for data on teachers' professional development. He reported that meetings first with participating countries and then all members would take place in April to determine if the survey would meet their needs and how much financial funding could be provided. Anders expressed concern, however, that the survey does not include participation from the largest countries and also made two specific suggestions. First, he noted that it might be more interesting to examine how teachers and principals use the autonomy of the school for school leadership rather than looking at overall differences in school autonomy (i.e., practice versus

policy). Second, he suggested focusing on the general relationship between teacher evaluation and professional development rather than concentrating on the reward system. Andreas acknowledged Anders' concern that country participation is limited at this point but expressed confidence that more countries would join if the pilot is successful. He also expressed interest in Anders' suggestion to focus on linking the evaluation system to professional development and indicated that he would relay the recommendation to his colleagues.

Esther also expressed a positive view towards the survey on teachers, teaching, and learning and specifically asked that the developers of the teacher survey take into consideration the original principal survey. Andreas confirmed the OECD's intention to develop an instrument that is both comparable internationally and compatible with the other questionnaires in PISA. Eugene then asked how much time teachers would be expected to spend in completing the survey. Andreas replied that 40 to 45 minutes would be the maximum amount of time expected by the international survey but that individual countries able to obtain more time from their teachers could include a national extension. He added that professional teacher organizations have expressed a willingness to be involved in the survey and that the long-term engagement of teachers would likely depend a great deal on the quality of the instruments. Finally, Jay requested that Network members be included on the distribution list for information about the activity and also asked about the possibility of collecting information on career paths for school directors and new teachers. Andreas agreed to include Network A in the distribution and to convey Jay's question about career paths to the participating countries.

Regarding the possibility of collecting data on teaching effectiveness (from the Network A-C joint committee), Andreas explained that the original proposal had been revised in conjunction with the Network A and C Chairs after receiving a mixed reception at the Joint Session last fall. However, the revised proposal then received a strong negative reaction from the SMG but will next be discussed at the Joint Session. Andreas elaborated on two concerns related to this activity. The first concern is that such a study is too complex and financially expensive. The second concern is that undertaking such a project may jeopardize the INES system's current success in engaging support from national stakeholders. Andreas concluded that even if the activity is included in the priority rating list distributed to member countries, he expects that it will not receive the majority support needed to take it forward. Eugene added that he expects the Joint Session will uphold the recommendation of the SMG and that he has made no commitment on behalf of the Network to the project.

Last, Andreas elaborated on the OECD's cooperation with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) on rural education indicators, describing the partnership as a success because of UNESCO's ability to offer legitimacy and support in countries where the OECD is not as involved. After a successful pilot, instruments for a reporting system are now being implemented in all countries and will provide OECD countries the opportunity to benchmark themselves against countries such as China.

Report from the Data Group

In the next session, Iris updated members on the work of the data group in two areas: the database of national-level activities and cooperation among international organizations. In

addition, Maria summarized the preliminary analysis of the national activities survey presented in the winter 2006 newsletter, and Lynne elaborated on the working group's discussion regarding the Network A statement presented to the IEA general assembly and the OECD secretariat following the Iceland meeting.

Discussion on the data group's work opened with a suggestion by Anders to include several European Commission activities not listed in Iris' table of national activities. Iris clarified that the table was not meant to be a comprehensive overview but rather was intended to give members an idea of a method for organizing the available data.

Anders continued his comments with an affirmation regarding the need for coordination among the various international organizations. He suggested establishing a "congress" or forum for all those involved in education policy in order to increase consistency in the level of information provided to each organization. A number of members expressed support for Anders' suggestion, and Jürgen Horschinegg specifically asked which institution or structure would assume the role of inviting organizations to participate in such a forum.

In response to Lynne's presentation, Andreas indicated that countries' demands for data have been very clear, and thus the only question has been how to meet these demands.Eugene stated that countries and organizations have struggled with how to clearly articulate both what they need and what they can provide and that the role the Network hopes to play is in helping to bring clarity to the issue. He added that the decision about providers has shifted from countries to organizations, and part of the issue with clarity would be to ensure that countries rather than organizations serve as the main decision-makers. In response, Andreas maintained that the organizations base their work on the data strategies developed by countries and thus one cannot say organizations are taking the decision away from countries.

In response to Andreas' comment regarding competition, Anne-Berit Kavli pointed out that the problem for smaller countries is an overload of testing and the necessity of choosing which studies to participate in. She noted that Norway considers not only which studies best meet their needs but also which other countries are participating in the study, for the sake of comparison.

Several members requested additional information on UNESCO's study on 9-year-olds and its use of the PISA framework. Andreas explained that UNESCO, in response to demands from its larger member countries, is seeking an assessment of 9-year-olds that is compatible to PISA. However, he noted that UNESCO does not have a preference for which organization develops the assessment and that perhaps IEA would be the most ideal provider. He noted that the OECD has been having discussions on how to make the PISA strategy more relevant among partner countries but acknowledged that there is debate even within OECD countries as to which age group (9-year-olds or 12-year-olds) should be assessed as part of the younger cohort. He concluded that the demand for the 9-year-old assessment is clear, but that the supplier remains to be determined.

Maria concluded the session by reminding members that the question presented by the working group was if they should proceed with drafting a terms of reference for a group that might be convened to increase cooperation among different organizations.

Report on Written Consultation for New Development Areas

Following the report and discussion on the data group's activities, Luc presented on the development group's initiative to identify possible new areas for development. He provided a preliminary list developed in consultation with the working group, and outlined a process for engaging the full Network membership. He finished his presentation with a question to Andreas regarding the boundaries on the Networks' work in new areas. Andreas replied that, in general, all three Networks pursue their own development work. Although the SMG sometimes expresses strong views, as with the teacher effectiveness study, those cases are usually exceptions. He suggested adding possible new development areas to the priority rating list in order for the Network to gain an idea of countries' interest in those areas. Maria added that the presented list of possible development areas included responses mostly from working group members and encouraged other Network members to submit additional ideas or reactions.

Iris suggested providing examples of development areas that have not been successfully undertaken, to provide an idea of limits to activities. Anders highlighted several recent publications on language competencies, surveys on ICT skills, and the influence of the education system on equity. Andreas added that the Network's consultation on new development work is well-timed because countries are in the process of deciding which assessment domains should be included in PISA 2009. However, he warned that countries' interest in domains thus far has been fairly limited to the traditional subjects of math, reading, and science but mentioned that several countries expressed interest in assessing ICT and civic engagement.

Discussion on EAG Indicators

The afternoon session opened with a presentation by Thierry Rocher, which provided an overview of the draft indicators for *Education at a Glance* 2006 and a summary of the analysis, reporting, and dissemination group's discussion on the indicators. Regarding the indicator on low achievers (students at level one and below level one) on the PISA 2003 mathematical literacy assessment, the working group commended the indicator for presenting the data in a new and interesting light but recommended simplifying the explanation and interpretation of the data. Specifically, the working group felt that the explanation of odds ratio was too complicated for the average reader and that the term "equity" could be interpreted in different ways.

Following the overview of the first indicator, members had an opportunity to ask questions and comment. Several members expressed their appreciation for the development of an interesting and politically relevant indicator but also indicated some concerns. Opening comments focused on the analysis of specialized and generalized learning effects, specifically the information provided in the last column in Table 4. Erich reminded members of the point he had made at the last meeting—that to label a country as having a generalized learning effect, one must be able to arrive at that conclusion whether considering low achievers in math who are also low in reading or low achievers in reading who are also low in math. He cited Japan as an example of a country that could not be classified as having a generalized learning effect if one considers low achievers in reading that are also low in math. Thierry acknowledged that perhaps a more precise term should replace "generalized" but disagreed that the terminology was entirely incorrect. He

maintained that when one focuses on low achievers in math, Japanese students' failure in math is more a sign of global failure in school rather than just a weakness in one subject. Regarding the terminology, Iris also emphasized the need to include clear and explicit guidelines for interpretation in order to prevent policymakers from misinterpreting the data. In response, Thierry suggested the possibility of using numbers instead of actual terms to differentiate the various types of learning effects.

Next, Ariane Baye made two general comments. First, she asked if Figure 1 would be more relevant if countries were sorted according to percentage of low achievers rather than mean score. Second, she recommended keeping the concept of equity as part of the indicator but suggested replacing the term "equity" with a phrase such as "equality of achievement," which is not as suggestive or politically charged. In response, Thierry clarified that Figure 1 had been sorted by the mean score in order to allow comparison of low achievers between two countries with similar means.

Andreas expressed concern regarding the methodology of the data analysis and asked, for instance, whether results would be different if the cutoff points for low achievers had been set only slightly differnet, e.g., 10 points higher or lower. He referred to Japan as an example of a country with a small group of low achievers whose results may change based on a different cutoff point. Thierry responded that low achievers referred to those scoring in level 1 and below level 1 and that Japan's 13 percent of low achievers could not be considered a small group of students. He suggested thought that additionally analyses could be undertaken to explore this question and bolster the validity of the results.

Gerry Shiel also made a few general comments. First, he stated that the multiple comparison table with the odds ratio was perhaps not very useful and could be replaced with more discussion of the actual odds ratio. Second, he asked about the inclusion of partner countries in the analysis and presentation of the data. Third, he questioned whether the analysis on learning effects should be included in the indicator. In response, Iris suggested keeping the multiple comparisons table but replacing the numbers with minus or plus signs, as is done in EAG. Thierry indicated that the table would be changed to just minus or plus signs or colors to make it easier to read. Jules added a final suggestion to include an explanation of differences in the data presented in the indicator and the original PISA report, referring specifically to any differences seen from the analyses using SES gradients.

Following discussion on the first indicator, Thierry gave an overview of the indicator on institutional differentiation and summarized comments from the working group. In general, the working group found this second indicator to be an interesting contrast to the first indicator in its focus on the macro-level. However, Thierry also acknowledged limitations and problems with the indicator and the working group's request for more clarity.

Discussion on the second indicator focused on possible inaccuracies in the data. A number of members emphasized the need to clarify the explanations and to provide explicit guidelines for interpreting the data, and several pointed out problems with the data. Regarding classification of programs, for example, Iris identified the data for Luxembourg to be incorrect, as the table lists only four programs when in reality there are seven. Several members identified problems with

grade repetition data in their countries. Anita Wester and Lynne both reported that their countries do not have a system of grade repetition (though there were figures for repeaters in the tables), and Anita asked if the data were calculated based on the percentage of students over the appropriate age for that grade. Don Hoium asked about the source of the data, and Thierry and Andreas informed members that the data were drawn from students' self-report in the PISA student questionnaire. In response, Don affirmed Anita and Lynne's concern about the data, maintaining that most jurisdictions in Canada do not have retention policies and that perhaps some students who repeated only one class reported that they had repeated the entire grade. Jay reminded members to take into consideration that students were reporting on 10 or more years of schooling (wherever it had occurred) and might have repeated grades before non-retention policies were instituted.

Jay also added that the data could provide interesting information on the productivity and efficiency of countries' education systems, as well as descriptive infomratinon on policies' relationships to culture or to a country's approach to increasing graduation rates. Andreas followed up by pointing out that despite taking into account some inaccuracies in data, one finds in all indicators exploring institutional differentiation that country's attempts to group students by ability is actually grouping by social background. Thus, as Jay commented, the indicator is an interesting statement on the inefficiency in the systems and the inequity of opportunity.

Thierry concluded the discussion by thanking Leslie Scott from the American Institutes for Research for helping to draft the indicators. Maria thanked members for their comments and requested that corrections to the data and any additional comments be sent to the ARD working group chair and the Network A Secretariat. She also commended the Thierry and the working group for undertaking such ambitious indicators and leading the Network in new directions. Last, Eugene added his commendation to the working group and the Network Secretariat for their work with the indicators.

Update on International Activities

Maria then briefly updated members on the progress of other international activities, including ALL, PIRLS, and TIMSS. She also informed members that ETS had released a data tool for analyzing ALL data, and Eugene added that the ETS website includes all the rounds of data from the International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS).

Next Steps and Closing

Following these updates, Maria summarized the main points of the meeting. She also thanked Mee-Kyeong Lee, the Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE), and the Korean Ministry of Education for organizing and hosting the meeting, the Network A Secretariat for their support, and the members for their participation in the Network. Eugene added a thank you to Maria for chairing the meeting, and the meeting was adjourned.

Note: the dates of the next meeting will be October 19-20, 2006 in Dublin, Ireland.